

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

3 ATLANTA DIVISION

4 UNITED STATES, )

5 Plaintiff, )

6 v. ) Case No. 1:18-cv-05774-AT

7 NANCY ZAK, )

8 CLAUD CLARK III, )

9 ECOVEST CAPITAL, INC., )

10 ALAN N. SOLON, )

11 ROBERT M. MCCULLOUGH, )

12 RALPH R. TEAL, JR., )

13 Defendants. )

14  
15  
16 REMOTE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF

17 JED CHAIM LINSIDER,

18 a witness herein, called by the Plaintiff for  
19 examination, conducted at the location of the  
20 witness in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 12, 2021,  
21 commencing at 9:05 a.m. EST, before Ann Medis,  
22 Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public  
in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

**Exhibit**

1394

A P P E A R A N C E S

(All participants attended via  
Webex videoconference.)

On behalf of Plaintiff

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, TAX DIVISION

BY: HARRIS PHILLIPS, ESQUIRE

ERIN R.HINES, ESQUIRE

RICHARD ROSE, ESQUIRE

AMANDA REINKEN, ESQUIRE

P.O. Box 7238, Ben Franklin Station

Washington, D.C. 20044

202.514.6619

[harris.j.phillips@usdoj.gov](mailto:harris.j.phillips@usdoj.gov)

[erin.r.hines@usdoj.gov](mailto:erin.r.hines@usdoj.gov)

[richard.g.rose@usdoj.gov](mailto:richard.g.rose@usdoj.gov)

[amanda.j.reinken@usdoj.gov](mailto:amanda.j.reinken@usdoj.gov)

A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)

On behalf of Defendant Nancy Zak

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

BY: LAURA MULHERIN, ESQUIRE

BENJAMIN LITTLE, ESQUIRE

1501 K STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

202.736. 8000

lmulherin@sidley.com

blittle@sidley.com

On behalf of Defendants EcoVest Capital, Alan Solon,

Robert McCullough, Ralph Teal and the Deponent

COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP

BY: BENJAMIN J. RAZI, ESQUIRE

MATTHEW MILLER, ESQUIRE

One CityCenter, 850 Tenth Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001-4956

202.662.5807

brazi@cov.com

mmiller@cov.com

A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)

1 On behalf of Defendant Claud Clark

2 CAPLIN & DRYSDALE, CHARTERED

3 BY: ROSS SHARKEY, ESQUIRE

4 1 Thomas Circle, N.W., Suite 1100

5 Washington, D.C. 20005

6 202.862.5000

7 rsharkey@capdale.com

8  
9 Also present

10 Joe Townsend, videographer

1 Just move on to the next question.

2 MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Ben.

3 BY MR. PHILLIPS:

4 Q. I think you'll find, Mr. Linsider, our  
5 deposition will go a little bit faster and easier  
6 if you aren't so hung up on some of the  
7 vocabulary.

8 Now, you stated at the beginning -- let  
9 me start --

10 MR. PHILLIPS: Amanda, you can take the  
11 Excel down, but let's leave the screen share up,  
12 please. You might want to...

13 BY MR. PHILLIPS:

14 Q. Mr. Linsider, I don't see an Excel  
15 coming again for a while.

16 Mr. Linsider, you said earlier that you  
17 play a significant role in matters regarding the  
18 real estate that's used in these conservation  
19 easement deals; right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Is there an ending point to the  
22 acquisition process? That is, how do you know

1 when the real estate has been acquired such that  
2 it can now be used for one of these transactions?  
3 Is there a document or some sort of step that's  
4 taken that makes that decision final?

5 A. Are you referring to the closing, the  
6 MIPA?

7 Q. Yeah. Is there anything before the MIPA  
8 that would signal that there's been an agreement  
9 by EcoVest to acquire land for one of these deals?

10 A. Well, the MIPA would be the first  
11 binding contract, if you will.

12 Q. Okay. What's the role of the Letter of  
13 Intent in the process?

14 A. The Letter of Intent -- when we use a  
15 Letter of Intent, it's simply to -- as would be  
16 typical in any real estate transaction. If you're  
17 going to spend some money to evaluate a property  
18 or a potential use of the property, you want to  
19 know that you're going to have some time to do  
20 that without anybody else coming in and taking  
21 your spot.

22 Q. How frequently does EcoVest use a Letter

1 Q. The workflow for these deals.

2 A. Okay. Yes.

3 Q. Now, it was important to you to include  
4 Mr. Clark in discussions about the pipeline of  
5 these deals, isn't that fair to say?

6 A. He was included in these discussions,  
7 yes.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. At least in this discussion, the two  
10 that you highlighted.

11 Q. He was regularly included in the  
12 pipeline discussions, wasn't he?

13 A. For deals he was involved with, yes.

14 Q. We're talking about the core deals.

15 A. As the appraiser.

16 Q. So with respect to the core deals, the  
17 conservation easement transactions that this case  
18 is all about, Mr. Clark, he was in the pipeline  
19 discussions?

20 A. Yes.

21 (Exhibit 172 was marked.)  
22

1 fair market value for the property at issue in the  
2 Beech Springs deal?

3 A. I don't know enough to answer the  
4 question.

5 Q. I'm not asking you to verify it or agree  
6 with it. I'm asking: As you sit here today, do  
7 you have any reason to dispute it?

8 A. I mean, this reads to me as a narrow use  
9 of terminology for purposes of calculating a  
10 transfer tax. So in that context, sure, I have no  
11 reason to dispute it.

12 Q. Great. Have you heard of an entity  
13 Clarion Partners?

14 A. It does not sound familiar.

15 Q. C-L-A-R-I-O-N.

16 A. It does not sound familiar.

17 Q. Let's go back to the PPM, which was  
18 Exhibit 162 with a doc ID ECOVEST-DOJ\_0128354.

19 A. Sorry. Exhibit which number?

20 Q. 162.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. Now, this was the PPM for Carolina Bays,



1 which was a 2014 transaction.

2 A. Okay.

3 Q. Page 4 of this PDF sets forth some of  
4 the offering details. I know it's hard to read,  
5 but the property location identifies 115.74 acres.  
6 Do you see that?

7 A. I do. I'm sorry. I'm just waiting for  
8 it to pull up in the share.

9 Q. It will be a lot quicker if you look at  
10 the screen share.

11 A. No, I understand. I just want to make  
12 sure I can have context if I need it. I'll let  
13 the document pull up, and I'll review what's on  
14 the screen share while it's coming up.

15 Q. I'm just directing you to the location,  
16 which is 115.74 acres in Horry County. Do you see  
17 that?

18 A. Okay. Yep, I do.

19 Q. Now, PDF page 45 of this document, the  
20 Estimated Use of Proceeds, it identifies the MIPA  
21 price as 4.6 million roughly. Do you see that?

22 A. Okay. I do.

1 Q. So the price EcoVest paid to acquire the  
2 property or an interest in the entity that held  
3 the property was just shy of 40 percent of the  
4 gross offering proceeds. That's what's in the  
5 PPM; right?

6 A. That looks about right just highballing  
7 the numbers. If you give me a minute, please, I  
8 want to...

9 Q. Well, the percent is in the next column.

10 A. Fair enough. Sorry. I'm looking at it  
11 on the screen, and it's small. So I didn't see  
12 the percentages.

13 Q. No problem.

14 A. Okay. Yeah. I see that.

15 Q. Now, for the property in the Carolina  
16 Bays transaction, did EcoVest actually do any  
17 development on the property?

18 A. Did EcoVest do any development on the  
19 property? Not -- the only development work that  
20 would have -- that was done by EcoVest is what's  
21 in the file for the offering.

22 Q. And then the conservation option was

1 in the life cycle of the project, of the property,  
2 which had not had any improvements on it at that  
3 point.

4 Q. When you negotiated the MIPA, you  
5 thought 4.6 million was a fair price to pay. Do  
6 you agree with me on that?

7 A. I do.

8 Q. You agree with me that 50 million would  
9 not have been a fair price to pay?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay.

12 MR. PHILLIPS: Let's take a little  
13 break. We can do it in just five minutes if that  
14 works for you guys.

15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record  
16 at 5:31 p.m.

17 (Recess from 5:31 p.m. to 5:41 p.m.)

18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record at  
19 5:41 p.m.

20 (Exhibit 181 was marked.)

21 MR. PHILLIPS: Exhibit 181 has doc ID  
22 ECOVEST-DOJ\_351845. That's 351845.